

*REMARKS/ARGUMENTS*

In response to the Office Action mailed May 3, 2006, Applicants amend their application and request reconsideration. No claims are canceled or amended but claims 7-9 are added so that claims 1-9 are now pending.

The Examiner requested a more specific title and a substitute title is supplied. In addition, an inappropriate paragraph is deleted from the specification.

New claims 7-9 are directly copied from claims 4-6. These claims do not require the scanning of the laser beam of ultraviolet light. Rather, the beam of ultraviolet light is directly focused on the entire first end region to convert that first end region into amorphous silicon, without the necessity of any scanning of the laser beam of ultraviolet light. These claims are clearly supported by the patent application as filed, particularly in the description at page 10, lines 15-23. Claims 4-6 are, on the other hand, supported by at least the description in the patent application at page 12, lines 7-18.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 were objected to but not rejected.


The two examined independent claims, claims 1 and 4, were rejected for double patenting of the obviousness type over claim 1 of co-pending U.S. patent application 10/530,026, published as U.S. patent publication 2006/0051943. Although not stated in the Office Action, this rejection is a provisional double patenting rejection because no claims have been allowed in the cited co-pending application. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

First, since the double patenting rejection is a provisional double patenting rejection, no response is required until claims are allowed in the co-pending patent application. The claims of the co-pending application were rejected in an Office Action mailed May 2, 2006 and a Response to that Office Action is being filed simultaneously with this Response. The Examiner will need to consult the newly submitted claims of the co-pending patent application in order to determine what action to take with respect to the double patenting rejection since original claim 1 of the co-pending patent application has been cancelled.

Second, the subject matter of the method claims of the two patent applications is quite different. In this application, as made clear by the claims, the ultraviolet light is employed to return at least partially crystallized silicon to an amorphous state for subsequent crystallization. This process is so different from the process claimed in application 10/530,026 that claims 1, 4, and 7 of this application cannot be obvious in view of the claims of the other application.

For each of the foregoing reasons, upon reconsideration, the double-patenting rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1, 4, and 7 allowed along with their respective dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jeffrey A. Wyand, Reg. No. 29,458  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER  
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20005-3960  
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)  
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date:

*August 24, 2006*